

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated November 23, 2007, and the Advisory Action dated April 24, 2008 have been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a supplemental response thereto.

Claims 1, 11, and 15-28 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 29-35 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-29 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

On page 3 of the Advisory Action, the Advisory Action presented several points why the application is not allowable. Also, on page 3 of the final Office Action, the Office Action asserted that page 30, step 11, Fig. 14, of 3G Security discloses “including in the request for registration an indication that the second security mechanism is used by the user equipment.” The Advisory Action further asserted that step 11 is merely the result of the selection of the multiple algorithms, therefore, the request inherently contained a first and a second security mechanism and as stated, step 1 includes “UE security capability.” However, Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s position that the request inherently contained a first and second security mechanism.

The final Office Action asserted that 3G Security discloses including in the request an indication that the second security mechanism is used by the user equipment. However, such an interpretation is erroneous. The final Office Action had previously suggested that step 2 in Fig. 14, of 3G Security corresponds to the request in claim 1.

Step 11 is an entirely separate message to step 2, and thus, what is sent in step 11 cannot be said to be “included” in what is sent in step 2.

It is respectfully submitted that including in the request an indication that the second security mechanism is used by the user equipment has been interpreted erroneously. Thus, the request is not inherently contained a first and second security mechanism. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest, at least, “including in the request an indication that the second security mechanism is used by the user equipment,” as recited in claims 1 and 15.


The Office Action indicated that the features that Applicants relied (i.e., page 20, lines 1-5, and page 17, lines 4-6) are not recited in the rejected claims. The features of page 20, lines 1-5, are merely used to show the advantageous embodiments of the present application. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the presently pending claims and thus fail to provide the critical and non-obvious advantages presented in the present application.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-28 be withdrawn at least for the reasons presented above and the reasons expressed in the response of March 19, 2008.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Sejoon Ahn  
Registration No. 58,959

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

SA:dc

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
RCE  
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal  
Check No. 18743